



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

century, that "satiric, convivial, gnomic, and love epigrams are developing rapidly" in the fifth century, and that "the epigram was early considered a distinct branch of literature." To a considerable extent her disagreement with Reitzenstein is due to her less skeptical attitude toward the epigrams attributed to classical poets in the literary tradition, and to her inclusion of material from Archilochus, Theognis, Euenus, and others that is usually treated as elegy rather than epigram. To a less degree the difference may be due to the elasticity of descriptive terms: who shall say whether the mere appearance of the name of the dead or of the dedicator *extra metrum* is sufficient to stamp an epigram as "a recognized form of *Kunstichtung*"? All depends upon Reitzenstein's understanding of the terms employed; Miss Gragg is evidently attaching a different import to them.

In general the conservative attitude toward Reitzenstein's ingenious theories is commendable, especially in respect to the contention of the German scholar that the "literary" epigram necessarily presupposes the collection in book form of inscribed epigrams; nor are we disposed to object to the charity of the author in recognizing the authenticity of epigrams ascribed to early poets in MSS. But we must demur to the inclusion of the short elegiac poems of Euenus, Theognis, and others in an account of the epigram. Not that these poems do not belong in such a study, but simply that the writer, having once included them, immediately imposes upon herself a larger task—the history of τὰ ἐλεγεία and not merely of the epigram. For whatever connection they may have with epigram, their precise relation cannot be appreciated if they are considered apart from longer elegies. Miss Gragg does not need to be reminded that historical study of the epigram before 300 is impossible; the only historical introduction to the Hellenistic epigram is through τὰ ἐλεγεία in the broadest sense.

The essay bears every trace of careful workmanship: it shows an admirable command of the sources and of the interpretative material; it contributes interesting notes on the influence of other types, on meter, and on dialect; and it serves a very useful purpose in the mere collection of the scattered remains of early epigram, and in the convenient tabulation of recurrent details and formulas in the inscribed epigram. Although a defect in the plan has given rise to partial truth or total error, in execution the study is a model *Erstlingsarbeit*.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*P. Terenti Afri Hauton Timorumenos.* Edited, with Introduction, Notes, Critical Appendix, and Index, by F. G. BALLENTINE. Boston: Benj. H. Sanborn and Co., 1910. Pp. xxi+129.

This is a difficult book to review. It shows careful study of Terentian literature (with one odd gap, noted below), and independent examination

of the play itself. But the editor fails to keep clearly in mind the class of readers for whom he was, in theory, writing. The book forms part of a series professedly intended for college students. Such students will find much that it contains of no help, mere extraneous erudition; they will also miss much which they have a right to expect.

Of the sixteen pages of the Introduction four treat briefly the production of the *Hauton*, its plot, characters, and reputation. The other twelve present a new feature in editions of Terence, an excellent discussion of the Influence of Terence upon English comedy. There is not a word, however, about Terence's life and work, his merits and his weaknesses, his countrymen's estimate of him, his place in the history of Greco-Roman comedy and in Latin literature, his meter and prosody, stage performances, etc. Mr. Ballentine explains the omission of "the meter, prosody, etc., of Terence" as due to the fact that they are found in practically all of the annotated editions of Terence. But nowhere does he enumerate such editions or give a list of books or articles to which the intelligent student may go for light on the important topics named above. Yet the Notes and the Critical Appendix are full of references (e.g., to metrical matters, the illustrated MSS) which assume a large measure of the knowledge which the editor nowhere helps the student to acquire, at least in any systematic way. Too often, also, there are no notes on lines or groups of lines which, as the reviewer knows from experience, trouble college students. Help is not always given where it is first or most needed; *amicum* is genitive in 24, *iniquom* in 27, yet the form is first discussed in 606. One other fault in the presentation of the editor's stores of information is the fact that often books which have passed through many editions, such as the *Latin Grammar* of Stolz and Schmalz and the *Antibarbarus*, are cited without indication of the edition he was using.

The best part of the book is the Critical Appendix. Here the editor shows independence, knowledge, judgment, good taste. He is in general a conservative, yet is capable of innovation. He made good use of Professor Warren's *Bibliography of Terence* and his copy of Umpfenbach's edition, with Warren's own corrections and additions (see the Preface). Only a hint of the good things can be given. He rightly retains *suum* in Per. 7, keeps the MSS verse-order in 3 ff., retains 6-9 (with *simplici*, however, in 6), 48-50, and keeps *agrum* in 63 (of course he declines to insert it in 64). At 72 he gives a good text in reading *At enim me quantum*, etc. In 83 he declines to emend *meruisti* to *commeruisti*. In 135 he reads *dignum quovis* (instead of *quovis dignum*), correcting Umpfenbach's report of A's reading. For other good textual notes see on 176, 183 (here he omits *magna* as a gloss, and retains *usque*; *iam inde usque a pueritia*, it might be added, makes an adjective with *familiaritas* needless), 192. Punctuation comes in for a good share of attention, with results usually good: see on 82-83, 114, 128, 140, 163, 181.

The change in 162, however, gives an unnatural place to *hodie*: no one need be afraid of medial incision (see Professor Goodell's paper, "Bisected Trimeters in Attic Tragedy," *Classical Philology* I, 145-66).

In the commentary there is much of interest and value. Especially good are the notes describing various expressions as "proverbial" and the notes bringing Terence's verses beside their Greek originals, real or supposed (see, e.g., on 61-62, 63-64, 293-95). In the latter connection, however, the editor has missed a chance (see, e.g., on 440) to bring out the wide difference which sometimes obtains between Terence's verses and those cited by ancient authority as his originals. Professor West, in his edition of the *Andria* and the *Hauton* (1888), pp. xxix, 154-55, showed very briefly but well how such a discussion might illuminate the question of the originality of Latin literature. The lack of such a general discussion is emphasized by the fact that the Index contains no caption referring to Greek at all and does not contain the name of Menander or that of Philemon. The citations from modern English plays help at times. Notes giving reminiscences of Plautus in Terence and reminiscences of Terence in later Latin authors are also good and helpful.

The author seems oddly unfamiliar with American work which touches Terence more or less closely. A knowledge of Miss Saunders' dissertation, *Costume in Roman Comedy* 30-39, would have eliminated from p. 57 the groundless statement that the Prologus carried an olive branch; the two passages cited from Livy are in no way relevant and the illustrated MSS are against Mr. Ballentine's view. In the note on 46 there should have been a reference to Professor Flickinger's paper, "On the Prologue to Terence's *Heauton*," *Classical Philology* II, 157-62. Study of Professor Clement's paper on "The Use of *enim* in Plautus and Terence," in *AJP* XVIII, 402-15, and of Professor Kirk's on "*Etiam* in Plautus and Terence," *ibid.* 26-42, would have led to better notes (e.g., on 72, 235, etc.) on these two poor words, so shamefully treated by editors and critics of Plautus and Terence. On 313 a reference might have been added to Professor Harkness' paper in *AJP* XXXI, 154-74, "The Final Monosyllable in Latin Prose and Poetry."

In a number of places I differ from Mr. Ballentine in interpretation, in others again I think more helpful matter might have been added to his notes, even by one who kept steadily in mind the college student. But for detailed discussion of such points there is here no room.

To sum up, there is in this book abundant evidence of long, faithful, and fruitful study of Terence. It is to be hoped that Professor Ballentine will continue that study. Increasing experience in editing will brush aside the weaknesses which this book shows on the side of presentation.

CHARLES KNAPP